



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,850	05/17/2006	Deborah Addison	101713-5041	8913

28977 7590 02/01/2011  
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1701 MARKET STREET  
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-2921

EXAMINER
----------

BROWN, MICHAEL A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3772

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/01/2011

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/579,850	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ADDISON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> MICHAEL BROWN	<b>Art Unit</b> 3772	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-13,20 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-13,20 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 7, 11, 13 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canada '761 in view of Hill '906.

Regarding claims 1, 20 and 21 Canada discloses a wound dressing material (col. 1, lines 7-8) comprising a polymeric substrate (col. 6, lines 15-27), a silver salt (col. 8, lines 21-42) which is a complex of Ag<sup>+</sup> and an anionic polymer, and a dyestuff (col. 7, lines 53-61) which is a silver salt photostabilizer.

The recitation -- wherein the dyestuff is a silver salt photostabilizer -- is treated as a functional limitation of the dyestuff. While features of an apparatus may be recited either structurally or functionally, claims directed to an apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function, because apparatus claims cover what a device is, not what a device does (*Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc.*, 909 F.2d 1464, 1469, 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990)). Thus, if a prior art structure is capable of performing the function as recited in the preamble, or elsewhere in a claim, then it meets the claim. As disclosed by applicant, on page 11 lines 6-20, applicant discloses the dyestuffs can stabilize the silver salts against photochemical

Art Unit: 3772

decomposition by absorbing light near the surface of the material. The dyestuffs also trap photochemically generated free radicals that could otherwise react with the silver. In this way the dyestuffs can act as a photochemical desensitizer. Thus, in the manner as disclosed by applicant, the dyestuff taught by Canada et al. in column 7, lines 53-61 function as, and comprises a silver salt photostabilizer.

Regarding claims 2-5, Canada discloses a wound dressing material wherein the substrate comprises a solid biabsorbable material such as oxidized cellulose (col. 6, lines 25-26) in woven form (col. 5, lines 27-29).

Regarding claim 7, Canada discloses a wound dressing material wherein the silver salt comprises from about 0.01 wt. % to about 5 wt. % of silver, based on the dry weight of the composition (col. 8, lines 43-55).

Regarding claim 11, Canada discloses a wound dressing material wherein the polymeric substrate consists essentially of a mixture of an oxidized cellulose with a collagen, a chitosan, or both a collagen and a chitosan (col. 4 lines 60 - col. 5, line 1).

Regarding claims 13, there is no positive claimed structure but rather a property met by a test is claimed. The properties of the wound dressing material disclosed in Lilienfeld are the same as those claimed by applicant; therefore Lilienfeld's material would be capable of, if subjected to the DPPH test, exhibiting essentially an antioxidant activity of at least about 15%. Therefore, the limitations of the claim are met.

Further, regarding the limitation of claim 20, "dyestuff in sufficient amount to stabilize the silver salt," the limitation has been treated as an intended use recitation. It has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus

Art Unit: 3772

is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987). Since the limitation has not been positively claimed, the dyestuff is capable of performing the recited function. However, Canada doesn't disclose the anionic polymer being a polycarboxylate or a carboxylate. Hill teaches a substrate comprising an anionic polymer and that polymer can be a polycarboxylate or a carboxylate (section 0157). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made that the anionic polymer disclosed by Canada could be a polycarboxylate or a carboxylate as taught by Hill in order to use a polymer that is absorbent to soiling of the substrate.

Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canada et al. (US 7118761) in view of Camden (US 6136835), along with Hill. Canada substantially discloses the invention as claimed; see rejections to claims 1- 5 and 7 above, including wherein the dyestuff comprises an antioxidant dyestuff (col. 7, lines 53-61). However, Canada is silent to the exact dyestuff selected.

Camden discloses a transdermal patch or dressing such as a bandage (col 16 ln 17-26) impregnated with an active ingredient to treat viral infection (col 1 ln 13-15) which includes suramin and analogues thereof (col. 13, lines 16-17) which is a known analog of trypan blue.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the wound dressing material of Canada with a dyestuff that is of

the antioxidant type such as the trypan blue analog suramin in view of the teachings of Camden in order to utilize an antioxidant type dye that is biocompatible.

Regarding claim 10, Canada fails to explicitly disclose the dyestuff is present in an amount of from about 0.2 to about 2wt.% based on the dry weight of the material.

To provide the wound dressing material of Canada with a composition comprising from about 0.2 to about 2wt.% based on the dry weight of the material of dyestuff, based on the dry weight of the composition, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of the teachings of Camden, in order to optimize the anti-microbial effect of the dressing material. Further, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have chosen an optimal concentration by weight of dyestuff, within the claimed range, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). The polymer could be a polycarboxylate or carboxylate as taught by Hill for the reason set forth above.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claims above, and further in view of Hirsch '900.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canada et al. (US 7118761) in view of Hirsch (1962900).

Regarding claims 12, Hirsch discloses a wound dressing material wherein the material is packaged in a sterile container (lines 5-11). Further, is well known and conventional in the art of wound dressings to package wound dressing and keep it

Art Unit: 3772

sterile prior to use and ensure that the dressing will prevent contamination of the wound at the site of bandage application.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to package the wound dressing of Canada with the microorganism impermeable container of Hirsch in order to maintain dressing sterility.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL BROWN whose telephone number is (571)272-4972. The examiner can normally be reached on 5:30 am-4:00 pm Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patricia Bianco can be reached on 571-272-4940. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Brown/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3772